

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS HARARE 000911

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE

AF FOR DAS T. WOODS
AF/S FOR B. NEULING
OVP FOR NULAND
NSC FOR DNSA ABRAMS, SENIOR AFRICA DIRECTOR C. COURVILLE

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [PGOV](#) [PREL](#) [PINR](#) [CVIS](#) [ZI](#)

SUBJECT: PROCEDURES FOR ZIMBABWE,S SANCTIONS REGIME

Summary

1. (SBU) As the USG prepares to adjust the Zimbabwe sanctions list, Post offers the recommendations below concerning classification of the visa sanction list, notifications of sanctioned individuals, and entry of names into the visa lookout system. Post will send via septel suggested additions/deletions from the visa sanctions list.

List Access And Dissemination

2. (SBU) Post recommends that the visa sanctions list be de-classified from Secret to SBU. The Secret classification complicates use of the list in the Consular Section, which is outside the CAA, and appears at odds with our required notification of each sanctioned individual. SBU designation would still afford a degree of control and confidentiality.

3. (SBU) According to our records, AF notified many currently sanctioned individuals of their status via letter signed by the then Assistant Secretary. However, many other sanctioned individuals were apparently not notified. We would propose that the Bureau notify by letter the remaining sanctioned individuals and also be responsible for notifying subsequently designated individuals.

List Maintenance And Implementation

4. (SBU) The sanctions lists are currently not consistent with one another, which we believe resulted from the entry of sanctioned individuals by the Bureau or Post without full consultation with or notification of each other. We propose that henceforth either the Bureau or Post can propose additions or deletions to the list but must receive concurrence from the other before an individual is added or deleted. Upon such concurrence, CA would be responsible for entering relevant data on the sanctioned individual into the Visa Lookout System.

5. (SBU) We would propose the same approach for the financial sanctions list. We understand that this list must go through additional vetting in an interagency process. However, we would propose that any relevant agency can suggest an addition or deletion to the list but that the change must be agreed interagency before it is put into effect, and that one agency, such as State/AF, be designated to make the changes. We also understand that a pending new executive order will allow greater flexibility in adjusting the list, which we welcome.

SAO Requests and Other Exceptions

6. (SBU) Post has implemented procedures to handle sanctioned individuals and others who may be sanctionable through the SAO process in visa adjudications, allowing one-time travel to, for instance, GOZ financial officials to attend IMF/World Bank annual meetings, a practice that provides leverage with the GOZ and that we plan to continue.
SCHULTZ